



**Date:** February 12, 2004

**To:** Project Area Committee Members

**From:** Otis W. Ginoza, Redevelopment Administrator

**Subject:** **Independent Study of Redevelopment**

---

The proposed Independent Study has been discussed at several Agency Board Meetings, including two special sessions dedicated solely to the topic of Independent Study. The Special Meetings, held on January 20, 2004, and February 3, 2004, were very productive and generated significant public comment. The draft Scope of Work was revised and updated to reflect input from the public and the Agency Board during these discussions. At the February 3, 2004 meeting, the Agency Board scheduled another Special Meeting dedicated to the topic of Independent Study. The Agency Board desired to accommodate members of the public unable to attend morning meetings, and scheduled the Thursday, February 19, 2004, Special Meeting for 6:00 p.m. at City Hall in the City Council Chambers.

The Independent Study was also on the Agenda for the regularly scheduled February 9, 2004, Agency Board Meeting, but no public comment on this subject was received and the Agency Board chose to forgo further discussion until the Special Meeting.

Staff suggests that a Request for Proposals (RFP) be approved and issued. The RFP would be advertised in print publications and sent to the list of consultants that have already been identified as possibilities (Exhibit A). As consultants regularly share information regarding RFPs, the RFP would be open to all those who wish to submit a response, not just those on the list of possible consultants.

During discussions regarding the preparation of the document for soliciting consultants, the Redevelopment Agency Board requested that, along with the inclusion of the Scope of Work, a record of ongoing public comments be provided as an addendum to the RFP. Staff has prepared a draft RFP (Exhibit B) that incorporates the Scope of Work and Public Comments. This is still a draft document and any or all portions of the document are open for feedback and revision.

Project Area Committee Members  
February 12, 2004  
Page 2

We encourage those with an interest in the Independent Study to attend this February 19, 2004, Special Meeting. Feedback and input from the community has been a significant catalyst in this process, and we continue to welcome community response. We also invite the public to visit the Independent Study Page of the Redevelopment Website (<http://www.longbeach.gov/redevelopment>) for more information about the Independent Study and Redevelopment.

If you have feedback or suggestions, please contact Otis Ginoza, Redevelopment Administrator (570-5093).

OWG:JMV

Attachments:           Exhibit A – List of Possible Consultants  
                              Exhibit B – Draft Request For Proposals

cc:     Reginald I. Harrison, Deputy City Manager  
          Barbara A. Kaiser, Redevelopment Bureau Manager  
          Otis W. Ginoza, Redevelopment Administrator

DRAFT – POSSIBLE CONSULTANTS LIST  
INDEPENDENT STUDY OF REDEVELOPMENT

**\*All descriptions are provided by consultants.**

A.C. Lazzaretto & Associates	Burbank, CA	A.C. Lazzaretto & Associates is a highly respected professional research and management consulting firm specializing in servicing municipal agencies. We utilize our diverse experience in administration and management to serve our clientele with accurate and reliable guidance, information, project management, and implementation. Our primary expertise is in redevelopment and economic development.
Advanced Policy Institute	UCLA, School of Public Policy and Social Research	The Advanced Policy Institute (API) is an applied research and development center and one of the primary outreach arms of the UCLA School of Public Policy and Social Research. Established in 1995, API addresses a variety of strategic policy needs by furthering the professional development of those working in the public interest, supporting efforts to access and apply research, developing innovative information technology tools to deal with policy challenges, and building new and mutually beneficial relationships between the university, policymakers and community leaders. API's programs link academic research with the experience and practical knowledge of policy practitioners and community leaders, focusing on topics such as housing, community and economic development, health care, social services and disability issues.
Allan D. Kotin & Associates	Los Angeles, CA	Allan D. Kotin & Associates (ADK&A) is a real estate economics consulting firm based in Los Angeles, providing creative and innovative strategies and financially feasible solutions to complex real estate and policy issues. Since its founding in 1980, the firm has been involved in all major land uses: residential, retail, office, industrial, recreational, retirement, hospitality, and mixed-use projects. ADK&A now specializes in assisting both public agencies and private clients.
Bay Area Economics	Berkeley, CA	Since 1986, BAE has focused on The Economics of Place™, providing comprehensive real estate and urban development services to public, private, non-profit, and institutional clients throughout the U.S. Our work integrates people, policies, markets, and finance, resulting in concrete change to urban places.

California Budget Project	Sacramento	<p>The California Budget Project (CBP) serves as a resource to the media, policymakers, and state and local constituency groups seeking accurate information and analysis of a range of state policy issues. Through independent fiscal and policy analysis, public education, and collaboration with other organizations, we work to improve public policies affecting the economic and social well-being of low- and middle-income Californians. The CBP presents research findings and policy analyses to state and local policymakers in the form of testimony, written reports, and briefing materials. To increase public understanding of state fiscal policy issues, the CBP conducts an active outreach program involving presentations and workshops for a range of state and local organizations. Along with periodic briefing papers and in-depth reports, the CBP publishes a quarterly newsletter, Budget Watch, keeping readers updated on important developments in state and federal policy.</p>
California Policy Research Center	UC Berkeley	<p>The University of California established the California Policy Research Center in 1977 (as the California Policy Seminar), a systemwide research and public service program charged with applying the extensive research expertise of the UC system to the analysis, development and implementation of state policy and federal policy issues of statewide importance.</p> <p>CPRC provides technical assistance to policy makers, commissions policy-relevant research by UC faculty and affiliated researchers on major statewide issues, oversees legislatively mandated research projects, and disseminates UC research findings through publications, special briefings in the state capitol and other locations throughout California. CPRC also sponsors related activities with other university-based programs and state government entities.</p>
Center for California Studies	CSU Sacramento	<p>The Center for California Studies is a public service, educational support, and applied research institute of California State University, Sacramento. It is dedicated to promoting a better understanding of California's government, politics, peoples, cultures and history.</p>

Cotton/Bridges/Associates	Pasadena, CA	<p>Cotton/Bridges/Associates, a Division of P&amp;D Consultants, provides urban and community planning and environmental services to a wide variety of public agencies and private clients.</p> <p>CBA has provided high quality products at reasonable costs under rigorous schedules since 1976. We work closely with our clients to meet their objectives and achieve community consensus on important planning and environmental issues</p>
CSULB Economics Department (Joseph Magaddino)	CSULB	<p>The office publishes the annual CSULB <i>Economic Forecast for Southern California and its Counties</i>, which includes forecasts for employment by sector, personal income, retail sales and building activity for the five county region (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura counties), as well as separate forecasts for each county. The forecast is produced using an econometric model of the region developed and maintained by the Office of Economic Research.</p> <p>Faculty associated with the Office of Economic Research also conduct research funded by grants, contracts or other fee-for-service arrangements. In the past, CSULB researchers have produced economic impact studies for local businesses, have evaluated the effectiveness of government employment programs, and have assisted local governments in setting appropriate prices for water usage.</p>
Deloitte & Touche	Los Angeles, CA	<p>In today's changing global economy, businesses need trusted advisers. Because the Audit Services professionals of Deloitte national practices take the time to understand your business as well as the sectors in which you operate, we can help you identify major risks and opportunities over and above performance of the traditional financial reporting function.</p>
Economics Research Associates	Los Angeles, CA	<p>Economics Research Associates is an international consulting firm focused on economic analysis for the entertainment and leisure industry, real estate development, public-policy analysis, tourism, and economic development. ERA has completed over 14,000 assignments yielding unmatched experience in land use economics. In the process, the firm has made important contributions to some of the world's most innovative and successful development projects. Our projects span the globe and range from repositioning single land uses to New Towns planned over 30 years.</p>

Ernst & Young	Long Beach, CA	Integrity and professional competence are the cornerstones of our firm. We work hard to earn and maintain our clients' trust and confidence. To ensure that we provide quality professional services in an independent, objective, and ethical manner we have implemented a number of professional development initiatives and quality and compliance safeguards, including state-of-the-art methodology, quality control policies, supporting tools and technology, and training.
Hoover Institution	Stanford University	The principles of individual, economic, and political freedom; private enterprise; and representative government were fundamental to the vision of the Institution's founder. By collecting knowledge, generating ideas, and disseminating both, the Institution seeks to secure and safeguard peace, improve the human condition, and limit government intrusion into the lives of individuals.
Institute for Governmental Studies	UC Berkeley	The Institute of Governmental Studies (IGS) is a research unit of the University of California, Berkeley. IGS has become the University of California's primary center for interdisciplinary research in politics, government, and public policy. Institute faculty and scholars specialize in the study of American national, state, and local government and politics, public administration, technology and government, and public policy. Ongoing research focuses on such issues as the history of American political institutions, reapportionment in theory and practice, racial and ethnic politics in California, political regulation and campaign finance, immigration and citizenship, and institutional reform.
LECG	Los Angeles, CA	LECG experts are leading authorities in economics and finance, and include renowned academics, respected private industry leaders, and former senior-level government officials
Maximus	Los Angeles, CA	Provides a variety of management consulting services to state and local governments, universities, and the federal government and helps government entities improve program operations and performance.
Peter F. Drucker	Claremont Graduate University	Marie Rankin Clarke Professor of Social Science and Management. Founder of Leader to Leader Institute, which has its roots in the social sector and its predecessor, the Peter F. Drucker Foundation for Nonprofit Management, which in January 2003 transferred its ongoing activities to the new identity.  The Leader to Leader Institute furthers its mission

		"to strengthen the leadership of the social sector" by providing educational opportunities and resources to leaders. Continuing the work of the Institute since its founding in 1990, the Leader to Leader Institute serves as a broker of intellectual capital, bringing together the finest thought leaders, consultants, and authors in the world with the leaders of social sector voluntary organizations. By providing intellectual resources to leaders in the business, government, and social sectors, and by fostering partnerships across these sectors, the Leader to Leader Institute works to strengthen social sector leaders of the United States and of nations around the
Public Policy Institute of California	San Francisco, CA	The Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) is a private, nonprofit organization dedicated to improving public policy in California through independent, objective, nonpartisan research. The institute was established in 1994 with an endowment from William R. Hewlett.
RAND	Santa Monica	Our job is to help improve policy and decision making through research and analysis. We do that in many ways. Sometimes, we develop new knowledge to inform decision makers without suggesting any specific course of action. Often, we go further by spelling out the range of available options and by analyzing their relative advantages and disadvantages. On many other occasions, we find the analysis so compelling that we advance specific policy recommendations. In all cases, we serve the public interest by widely disseminating our research findings.
Rosenow Spevacek Group (Felicia Acosta)	Santa Ana, CA	Rosenow Spevacek Group provides community development consulting services for local government agencies, property owners and developers, helping our clients reach their visions for nearly a quarter century.
School of Policy, Planning, and Development	USC, Los Angeles, CA	We are a new and expanded School established two years ago through the joining of the Schools of Public Administration and Urban Planning and Development at USC. The learning synergies and interdisciplinary research made possible by this new school allow USC faculty and students to address the challenges of governing, managing, and leading in our complex urban and regional milieu emerging all around the world. It has strengthened our programs in health administration, public administration, public policy, real estate development, and urban planning. Our students and faculty are actively engaged in a wide range of analyses, problem solving, and professional activities in the areas of policy

		analysis, public sector management, urban planning and design, sustainable communities, health care management, and real estate and urban development.
Sedway Group	Los Angeles, CA	Sedway Group provides full-service real estate and urban economic consulting services to a distinguished array of private and public sector clients, ranging from small nonprofits to major international corporations.
Seifel Consulting	San Francisco, CA	Seifel Consulting is an economic consulting firm providing strategic real estate and urban economic advisory services. The firm the firm provides research, analysis, financial projections, written documentation, and project management for both public and private sector clients.
SPHERE Institute	Burlingame, CA	It is our mission to significantly improve the information provided to policy makers who design and revise welfare, health, education, and labor programs at the national, state and local level. To fulfill this mission, SPHERE offers practitioners a powerful policy analysis capability, providing specific, impartial advice and context for policy debates. In developing models for timely analysis, SPHERE has developed a deep understanding of health and social trends in California that also provides a solid infrastructure for its long-term research program. With these interrelated goals, SPHERE serves the interests of the public, government, business and the research community
Urban Futures, Inc.	Orange, CA	Urban Futures Incorporated was formed in 1972 combining the extensive urban planning experience of the founding principals. Today UFI offers public and private sector clients a wide range of specialized redevelopment, implementation, public finance and various rental and ownership compliance services. UFI is comprised of highly skilled professionals who are uniquely qualified to handle complex assignments. The Firm has provided financial, planning, and redevelopment services to more than 170 public sector clients.





# LONG BEACH REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

333 WEST OCEAN BOULEVARD, THIRD FLOOR ) LONG BEACH, CA 90802 ) (562) 570-6615 ) FAX (562) 570-6215

February 19, 2004

**RE: Request for Proposals – Consulting Services for a Study of Redevelopment in Long Beach.**

The Long Beach Redevelopment Agency (Agency) has approved the preparation of a study of redevelopment policies and programs in the City of Long Beach. This Request for Proposals (RFP) is being issued, open to all firms, or groups of firms, that can demonstrate an ability to perform the services described in the Scope of Work (Exhibit A). The Agency and community are seeking a fresh outlook to this study, and encourage a group approach representing diverse areas of expertise. Valuable areas of expertise include public policy analysis, California Redevelopment Law, public participation and any other areas of expertise that might contribute to addressing the Scope of Work. A team approach would be an effective way to incorporate the broad set of skills required for this study. The involvement of those who do not traditionally work in redevelopment is also encouraged.

The Redevelopment Agency has invited community organizations and members of the public to assist it with the preparation of the study. Additionally, members of the public will assist the Agency with the review of proposals. Public comments pertaining to the study have been provided as an addendum to give some insight into the concerns of the community. We also invite proposers to visit the Independent Study Information page of the Redevelopment website (<http://www.longbeach.gov/redevelopment>), which provides background on the steps taken thus far in implementing this study.

An agreement resulting from this RFP will conform to the form of the agreement in Exhibit B. The maximum expenditure for this study should not exceed \$ AMOUNT.

Enclosed you will find information on the minimum requirements to be considered by the Agency, as well as submission requirements for qualified firms. Proposals must be submitted in a SEALED ENVELOPE with the words "PROPOSALS – INDEPENDENT STUDY OF REDEVELOPMENT" written on the outside of the envelope.

Proposals should be submitted no later than 4:00 p.m. (PST), Wednesday, MONTH DAY, 2004, addressed as follows:

Otis W. Ginoza  
Redevelopment Administrator  
City of Long Beach  
Community Development Department  
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Long Beach, California, 90802

Late submissions and facsimile submissions will not be accepted.

This RFP does not commit the City or Agency to award a contract, to pay any costs incurred in the preparation of a submission in response to this request or to procure or contract for any services.

The proposer acknowledges that if the Agency executes a contract for work pursuant to the RFP, a contractor may not be an exclusive one and that the contract will not guarantee the proposer any work nor will there be any guarantee as to volume or duration of work or duration of the contract.

Specific questions pertaining to this request should be referred to Otis W. Ginoza at (562) 570-5093.

Sincerely,

MELANIE S. FALLON  
Executive Director,  
Long Beach Redevelopment Agency

## **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

### **CONSULTING SERVICES FOR A STUDY OF REDEVELOPMENT IN LONG BEACH**

#### **PROPOSALS SUBMISSION:**

The Redevelopment Agency will evaluate the proposals of the prospective consultants based upon their most recent experience in working on a project of similar scope and usage as the one requested by the Redevelopment Agency. Proposals will furthermore be evaluated on their effectiveness and creativity in addressing the items in the Scope of Work. Respondents must provide eight (8) copies – seven bound and one unbound – of their proposals, along with a PDF version on cd-rom, by the date and time set forth for consideration.

Submissions will be photocopied and reviewed by the Redevelopment Agency, staff and community organizations. Submissions should utilize a format that can be readily reproduced in black and white.

Although the format is discretionary, at a minimum, please include the information detailed below. For consulting teams, the information should be submitted for each consulting firm that is to be part of the proposed team.

#### **1. COVER LETTER**

Include the legal name of respondents, firm name, address and telephone number(s). Indicate whether the entity is a sole proprietorship, partnership or corporation, the state where the entity is resident and the year established. The letter should include the name, address and phone number of the person(s) to contact who will be authorized to represent your firm.

#### **2. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

Provide an introduction to your firm's background, experience and capabilities to perform the Scope of Work.

#### **3. DESCRIPTION OF APPROACH**

Provide a narrative description of the approach to be used in the preparation of a Study of Redevelopment in Long Beach. Include a schedule of performance for same, and describe any issues that may be of concern to your firm. Additionally, provide a brief

summary of design philosophy as it relates to the Study and its component parts and costs for each task listed in the Scope of Services.

#### 4. STAFFING AND RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

Provide information regarding your firm's current staffing, current workload and availability to provide the subject services.

List firms that will subcontract with the respondent(s) for technical work or other areas of expertise.

#### 5. EXPERIENCE AND REPRESENTATIVE PROJECTS

List representative examples of related work you and your identified technical subcontractors have performed for other public agencies over the past five (5) years that illustrate your firm's role and experience in providing the services required. Provide a narrative description of each, including descriptions of work performed and date and location of the assignment, and identify the key personnel involved.

#### 6. PERSONAL RESUMES

Provide personal resumes illustrating the experience and background of key personnel who will be assigned to the City/Agency.

#### 7. REFERENCES

Provide at least three (3) references of public agencies for which similar work has been performed including the name, title, agency, address and phone number(s) for each reference.

#### 8. COMPENSATION

Provide a time-and-materials fee schedule for the key personnel to be assigned to projects, for support staff and for costs to be billed separately as direct expenses, noting mark-up, if any, that will be applied. The maximum expenditure for this study should not exceed \$ AMOUNT.

Provide information relative to your billing procedures.

#### 9. COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Confirm ability to comply with the "Terms and Conditions" Section below. Explain with appropriate detail any inability to comply with a specific term or condition.

## **SCOPE OF WORK:**

See *Attachment A – Scope of Work*.

## **TERMS AND CONDITIONS:**

The following terms and conditions will apply to any subsequent agreement for services:

### **1. PERSONNEL**

The consultant represents that he/she has or will secure, at consultant's own expense, all personnel required to perform the services under the agreement. Such personnel shall not be employees, or have any contractual relationship with, the City or the Agency. All of the services required hereunder will be performed by the consultant or under his/her sole control, supervision, direction and responsibility, and all personnel engaged in the work shall be fully qualified and shall be authorized or permitted under state and local law to perform such services.

None of the work or services covered by the agreement, including the preparation of technical reports that may be required, shall be subcontracted without the prior written approval of the Agency. Any work or services subcontracted hereunder shall be specified by written agreement and shall be subject to each provision of the contract. The consultant shall be responsible for the management of all sub-consultants as noted above.

### **2. ASSIGNABILITY**

The consultant shall not assign or transfer any interest in the agreement (whether by assignment or novation) without the prior written consent of the Agency provided, however, that claims for money by the consultant from the Agency under the agreement may be assigned to a bank, trust company or other financial institution without such approval. Written notice of any such assignment or transfer shall be furnished promptly to the Agency.

### **3. INSURANCE**

Agency policy requires that prior to commencing or performing any phase of work, the consultant, at his/her own expense, provide the Agency with Certificates of Insurance and Endorsements for the coverage as listed below:

- Workers' Compensation Insurance or other proof that adequate self-insurance is in effect covering all persons who may be employed directly or indirectly in carrying out the work as outlined.
- General Liability and Property Damage Insurance to protect against claims and liabilities from personal injury, death or property damage arising from consulting activities, providing protection of at least \$1,000,000 for bodily injury or death to any

one person for any one accident or occurrence and at least \$1,000,000 for property damages.

- Professional Liability Insurance providing protection of at least \$1,000,000 combined single limit coverage per occurrence for the project covered.
- Automobile Liability Insurance in an amount not less than \$500,000 combined single limit per accident for bodily injury and property damages covering owned, non-owned and hired vehicles.

All insurance required shall be carried only by responsible insurance companies licensed to do business in the State of California. General liability and automobile liability policies shall name as additionally insured the City of Long Beach and the Long Beach Redevelopment Agency and their officials, employees, agents, representatives and members of all boards and commissions.

#### 4. FINDINGS PROPRIETARY

All of the reports, information, data and so forth prepared or assembled by the consultant under the contract shall become the sole property of the Redevelopment Agency, and the consultant agrees that they shall not be made available to any individual or organization without the prior written approval of the Agency.

#### 5. COPYRIGHT

No report, maps or other documents produced in whole or in part under the agreement shall be the subject of any application for copyright by, or on behalf of, the consultant.

#### 6. INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR STATUS

It is expressly understood that the consultant named in any proposed agreement is acting as an independent contractor, not as an agent or employee of the Agency.

#### 7. COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL LAW

The consultant shall comply with all applicable laws, ordinances and codes of the federal, state and local governments. Consultant shall save the Agency harmless with respect to any damages arising from any torts committed in performing any of the work embraced by the agreement.

#### 8. ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

The consultant shall comply with the attached "Additional Terms and Conditions" for Professional Services and "Insurance Requirements – Long Beach Redevelopment Agency."

## **SELECTION PROCESS:**

### **1. GENERAL PROCESS**

The Redevelopment Agency intends to review the proposals with the assistance of community organizations, and copies of any documents provided will be made available to the public. The Agency will select a small number of qualified applicants and invite them to provide an oral presentation to the Redevelopment Agency. The Redevelopment Agency, with the advice of community organizations, will select the firm that it believes is best-suited for this assignment.

### **2. NON-DISCRIMINATION**

The City hereby agrees not to discriminate on the grounds of race, religion, national origin, color, age, sex, sexual orientation, AIDS, AIDS-related condition, handicap, disability or Vietnam Era Veteran status in the selection process.

### **3. DISADVANTAGED, MINORITY AND WOMAN-OWNED BUSINESSES**

On February 9, 1988, the City Council adopted the City of Long Beach Disadvantaged, Minority and Woman-Owned Business Program. This program encourages the use of disadvantaged, minority and woman-owned businesses in all aspects of City contracting. See the attached program description for additional information.

## Draft Scope of Work

A Request for Proposals (RFP) to conduct an Independent Study of Redevelopment in Long Beach should be prepared. The RFP should specify that the consultant team include at least one member with extensive experience in California redevelopment.

### Consultant Selection Criteria

- California based consultant.
- Diverse set of consultants.
- Opposing viewpoints.
- Primary consultant should form a team of consultants to prepare Independent Study.
- RFQ should include all public comment as an addendum along with the Scope of Work.

### Public Input for Independent Study

- Anonymous suggestion process.
- Letters to Agency Board brought to Agency Board meeting.
- Will be public input for the preparation of the independent study.
  - Hold meetings at different times of day and locations.
  - Proposal should include public participation plan.

### Scope of Work

1. Review past and present practices of the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Long Beach.
  - Why was the Redevelopment Agency created?
  - Determine time period to be reviewed.
  - Determine Projects to be reviewed.
  - Agency vs. City responsibilities.
  - Communications/Relationship between Agency Board and City Council.
  - Define Success.
    - i. Economic Success.
    - ii. Design Success.
    - iii. Social Success.
    - iv. Quality of Life – University of Michigan Model.
  - Do case studies of following projects:
    - i. Long Beach Plaza
    - ii. Renaissance Walk
    - iii. 1890 Atlantic Liquor Store
  - Review Downtown Plan.
    - i. Original Goals vs. Achievements.



2. Conduct a thorough review and evaluation of Redevelopment strategies and techniques including pros and cons. Public participation strategies should also be reviewed.
  - What strategies/practices have been most successful?
  - What strategies/practices have been least successful?
  - How were they evaluated?
  - Potential formulas recommended to implement strategies.
  - Look at other cities.
  - Evaluate Redevelopment Agency efforts to explain its projects and programs to the public.
    - i. What are the costs of projects.
    - ii. What are the benefits of redevelopment projects.
3. Determine what strategies/practices are applicable to the City of Long Beach based on situational and demographic similarity. Use this to identify a list of relevant “best practices”.
  - Examine relationship of Agency staff to City management.
  - Staff Architect vs. Consultant Architect.
  - Time needed to start/complete projects.
  - Prepare project evaluations after completion.
4. Conduct a comparative analysis between Long Beach practices and those determined to be “best practices”.
  - Identify shortcomings.
  - Identify successes.
5. Identify and review methods for evaluating future projects.
  - Agency Design Review.
  - Fiscal Review.
    - i. Cost – Benefit Analysis.
    - ii. Impact on surrounding areas.
  - Quality of Life review.
  - Project Close-out reports.
  - Develop check list for evaluation of future Agency practices.
  - Create “Design Image Statement” at beginning of projects.
6. Identify and review methods of public participation that might enhance the redevelopment process.
7. Determine which strategies/practices would be beneficial to the City of Long Beach.
  - Long term planning for future projects.
  - Reports to Agency Board and Community on cumulative project costs.
    - i. Include staff costs.
  - How can Agency improve its service to the community.

8. What steps would be needed to implement strategies/practices determined to be beneficial?
9. Evaluate Agency efforts to explain its projects and programs to the public.
  - Communications is one of the most important parts of Independent Study.
  - Provide recommendations on how the Agency can better communicate with public following information.
    - i. Total project costs.
    - ii. Project benefits.
      1. Economic.
      2. Quality of life.
      3. Design.
    - iii. How can the Agency better communicate with citizens who are not active in the public discussion of redevelopment.
10. The issues of Merger and Expansion and other options (as part of best practices).
  - What are the consequences of Merging the project areas, pro and con?
    - i. How will roles of Agency, staff and City Council change?
    - ii. Impact on Stakeholders.
  - What are the pros and cons of the project area Expansion?
  - Will merger lead to greater success of and/or more expedient completion of redevelopment projects in Long Beach?

City of Long Beach  
- Form of Contract to be -  
Inserted Here

## **Summary of Public Comment Proposed Independent Study of Redevelopment**

Prepared February 5, 2004

### **Recent Correspondence**

---

February 4, 2004, e-mail from Traci Wilson-Kleekamp. This e-mail is attached and discusses the Felise Acosta Reports.

February 3, 2004, e-mail from Jane Kelleher. This e-mail is attached and provides commentary on one of the discussions at the February 3 meeting.

### **February 3, 2004**

#### **Special Agency Board Meeting**

#### **Public Comments on the Independent Study (prepared from staff's notes)**

---

Lewis Lester submitted a letter dated February 2, 2004 (attached)

#### **Speaker #1**

(A board member suggested that the Agency hold a special meeting on February 19, 2004, to review the RFP. Speaker #1 commented on this recommendation.)

- The North PAC meeting is on February 26 and it would be better to hold the Agency Board Meeting after the North PAC meets.

#### **Speaker #2**

- Thought that the Agency discussion on communications focused on how the Agency could promote its projects to the public. What is needed is a critical discussion of Agency projects.

#### **Speaker #3**

- The Agency has a communications issue it needs to address. The need is for the Board to listen to the public rather than for the Board to sell its projects to the public.
- The Agency needs to have a meeting in the expansion areas discussing the Independent Study.
- The Independent Study should include a case study that would determine how the Central Project Area benefited from its merger and expansion and if the project area has benefited from redevelopment activities.

#### **Speaker #4**

- Troubled that the initial discussion of the communications issue was how to create a sales pitch for Agency programs.
- He also heard that the Agency wants to better communicate that the Independent Study is being conducted.

- Felise Acosta suggested a manual for better communications. We should develop a roadmap for improving communications.
- The Board has suggested that it better communicate its redevelopment successes. How do we know if a project area is a success if we have no standards and goals for redevelopment to tell us what a success is?

Speaker #5

- It is important for the Agency to hear the views of citizens who understand redevelopment as well as the views of those citizens who are not actively involved.
- Expressed opposition to the Independent Study process because it is primarily a planning document. The Agency needs a performance audit. We need to know how the Agency is spending money and what internal controls exist.
- Need to look at Agency spending, transfers to the General Fund and spending outside of project areas.
- Need to examine the bid process for Agency contracts.
- Need to examine the Redevelopment Agency's affirmative action goals and accomplishments and its hiring of local businesses.
- Need more financial and internal controls in redevelopment.
- All of the money is going to overhead, administration and debt service and not to projects.
- Affordable housing is not being built.
- There is no way to determine if the Agency is fulfilling its fiduciary responsibility.
- The Scope of Work does not address the issues listed above.
- If staff is only sending information to the PACs, then people who live outside of the project areas are not receiving information on the Independent Study.
- The Agency Board needs to communicate with people who live outside of the project areas.

Speaker #6

- We need to find out if other cities are working from a long-term plan. Do they have goals, strategic plans and a vision in mind before they start?
- The Agency needs to communicate its long-term goals and vision to people who develop the project area.

Speaker #7

- The audit Speaker #5 described is exactly what we need.
- The Independent Study should not focus on communication. It should examine current conditions and then determine what areas need to be studied.
- There must be a way to quantify quality of life issues and include them in the analysis.

Speaker #8

- Communication needs to be two-way communication.
- The Redevelopment Agency needs a procedures manual.

- Asked that items number 9 and 10 in the Scope of Work be switched so that everything is examined before the merger and expansion.
- The Broadway/Golden School should be considered for one of the case studies.

**Speaker #9**

- Need to have a quantitative analysis of everything that has been done and everything we plan to do.
- Liked the idea of a redevelopment education program.
- Need to look at the pros and cons of what the Agency has done in the past and learn lessons.
- We need to know how redevelopment affects people located outside of the project areas.

**Correspondence Received for the February 3, 2004, Agency Board Meeting**

February 2, 2004, e-mail from Lewis Lester. The e-mail had an attachment, which contained a letter from Mr. Lester to the Redevelopment Agency Board. The e-mail and letter are attached.

February 1, 2004, e-mail from Lewis Lester. This e-mail is attached. The e-mail had an attachment titled "City of Miami, Office of Auditor General, Audit of the Community Redevelopment Agency." This lengthy document (81 pages) is not attached, but can be viewed on the Redevelopment Agency's Independent Study web page. It is also available from Redevelopment Bureau Staff.

February 2, 2004, e-mail from Laurie Angel. This email is attached. The e-mail contained an attachment, which consisted of a document titled "American Planning Association Policy Guide on Redevelopment." This document (16 pages) is not attached, but can be viewed on the Redevelopment Agency's Independent Study web page. It is also available from Redevelopment Bureau Staff.

**January 26, 2004**

**Agency Board Meeting**

**Public Comments on the Independent Study (prepared from staff's notes)**

---

**Speaker #1**

- Clarified suggestions regarding the evaluation of a merger as part of the Independent Study.

**Speaker #2**

- Agreed with Speaker #1.
- Stated that there is much sensitivity about the proposed project area expansion.

**The following comments were provided to staff via e-mail on January 23, 2004:**

---

- Is there a process that can be set up to coordinate projects with private developments in the surrounding area in a holistic approach?
- What is the role of the Redevelopment Agency regarding infrastructure needs in the City?
- Did not see anything in the notes from the Study Session about the remarks made on behalf of the CPAC membership.

**January 20, 2004**

**Special Redevelopment Agency Meeting**

**Public Comments (prepared from staff's notes)**

---

Speaker #1

- The timeline is one of the last things the Agency Board should determine.
- Please send the expanded Scope of Work to the public.

Speaker #2

- The Board did not mention the project area expansion when it discussed the merger.
- A panel of consultants should prepare the Independent Study.

**January 12, 2003**

**Redevelopment Agency Meeting**

**Public Comments (prepared from staff's notes)**

---

Speaker #1

- One of the study sessions needs to be in the evening or a Saturday afternoon so that more of the public may participate.

Lewis Lester

- Mr. Lester read a prepared statement a copy of which is attached.
- The Independent Study should examine the way the Redevelopment Agency appraises the value of property, issues RFPs, solicits owner participation, selects developers and utilizes eminent domain. All of those processes are controversial.

Speaker #3

- Look at the promises made to the public during the project area adoption process.
- Look at the one-mile and ten-mile rings to determine the impact of redevelopment.
- The Agency should set a time for the consultants to meet with the public.

Speaker #4

- Impressed with the ideas discussed, especially the word “accountability” and the determination of project costs.
- The Independent Study should include cost benefit studies on past projects.
- The Board should not consider using any consultants who derive their income from redevelopment agencies as the lead consultant.
- A university or a think tank should be the lead consultant, and they could subcontract for the services of a redevelopment consultant.

Speaker #5

- Accountability is extremely important.
- We should be able to track costs by project.
- CURE and Municipal Officials for Redevelopment Reform should be considered as potential consultants.
- The Scope of Work should be changed to read “merger, expansion and other options”. One option to consider is ending redevelopment and using other methods that might better achieve the goals.

**December 15, 2003**

**Redevelopment Agency Meeting**

**Public Comments (prepared from staff’s notes)**

---

Speaker #1

- Need a well-balanced steering committee.
- Need to ask these questions:
  - Are we better off today because of redevelopment?
  - Are we better off with multiple project areas or would we be better off with merged project areas?

Speaker #2

- Requested information on the documentation of redevelopment agency debt.
- PAC members and Agency Board members have an interest in expanding the project areas. Outsiders should be part of the Independent Study.

Speaker #3

- The Redevelopment Agency should stop all document destruction, as they may be needed for the Independent Study.
- Expressed concern that staff will have too much influence on consultants since staff may speak with consultants out of the presence of the public.

Speaker #4

- The Redevelopment Agency needs to prepare a forensic audit. KPMG could prepare an audit to see how much money has been spent in the last 15 years.



- Expressed concern that staff will recommend only consultants that favor redevelopment. An RFP should be sent out and any consultant allowed to submit.

Speaker #5

- A small group should make the decisions; the Agency Board should be the steering committee.
- There is a great need for trust.

Speaker #6

- PAC representatives on a steering committee should be given time to consult with the PACs.
- The Independent Study should examine all elements: what has been done here, best practices, how redevelopment occurred in Long Beach, what could be done better and are merger and expansion appropriate at this time?
- Input should come from everywhere not just the Agency Board.

Speaker #7

- All of the questions described in the Felise Acosta Study need to be addressed. That should be done before the rest of the Independent Study.

Speaker #8

- The Independent Study needs community buy-in, and not be staff controlled.
- The Agency Board could be the Steering Committee.
- Bry Myown should be a member of the Steering Committee.
- Laurie Angel should be on the Steering Committee.

Speaker #9

- In May of 1999, Felise Acosta's report discussed communications, and these issues need to be addressed.
- We need a forensic audit.
- People from the expansion area should be added to the Steering Committee.

Speaker #10

- Expressed concern that the Steering Committee is only the Agency Board. One subject that could be considered is the need for a separate Agency Board?

**A PAC member submitted the following recommendation for an Independent Study during the merger discussions.**

**PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT STUDY**

Issue an RFQ to independent research or urban public policy institutes with a track record of evaluating redevelopment. The chosen research firm will address the following scope of work.

Conduct a history of the City of Long Beach Redevelopment Agency to determine redevelopment practices and how and why they have changed over time. Explicitly identify current practices at length including:

- How projects are planned from inception.
- The steps undertaken to determine the fit of projects for a particular area.
- How project funding is determined.
- Identify the PACs' role in the process.
- Identify the public's role in the process including initial contact, responsiveness to suggestions, and define current public interfaces and evaluate the effectiveness of the public hearing process.
- Identify each stakeholder's role in the redevelopment process.

Conduct a comprehensive comparative study of other redevelopment areas throughout the state.

- What redevelopment techniques have proven most successful and why.
- What has proven to be unsuccessful and why.
- Determine what best practice is.

Establish criteria to determine successful redevelopment or "best practice." Such as:

- Return on investment for various time frames in the project's life.
- Increase in property tax value in the project or developed area.
- Demographics? Or the like.

Evaluate the City of Long Beach redevelopment practices against the comparative study and best practice. Recommend improvements to redevelopment in the city and define a method to implement these changes.

Conduct public hearings and study sessions throughout the city and develop a consistent redevelopment model with specific recommendations for improving the city's redevelopment process.

\*\*\*

## **Corrections Welcome**

This summary of public comment on the proposed Independent Study of Redevelopment was prepared by Redevelopment Bureau staff from notes taken during public meetings. Meeting participants who feel that their statements were omitted, misinterpreted or are incorrect are invited to submit their corrections to Otis Ginoza, Redevelopment Administrator, at (562) 570-5093.